2/11/72

Mr. Fred Graham
The New York Times
1920 L St., NW
Washington, D.C.

Dear Fred,

It is now more than three weeks since you phoned as I recall to say that you would respond to the questions I sent you. During that conversation you did address some of these questions I believe honestly and fairly fully. However, I also believe you did not address all those I feel I will have to when I resume writing. The booksx is, as I told you, complete save for the epilogue in which I will include this affair.

I am aware that you must be busy. But I have to start writing. I think you understand that some of what I asked you has to be central to this matter. For this reason, and with what I hope you will believe is a desire to be fair to you, I have delayed the writing to give you time to say whatever you want to say. Time pressures on me are such that I simply will not be able to take the time to rewrite should you respond after I do the writing. With all the work I have begun, I will not be disposed to, either.

Moreover, it may become impossible. While I have some use of the left hand, it is restricted and it does require care. I can type for only part of the day. There is some kind of hidden damage that apparently cannot be fully diagnosed until healing has proceeded further than it has. I have an appointment with an orthopaedic surgeon for the first of the month. One of the possibilities is that the thumb will have to be opened so that some of the structures can be repaired. If this happens, I am certain that it will be some time before I can type again. Hence I must complete this and all other related work prior to then.

So, I do hope you can respond pretty soon. And that you will want to.

You may or may not have thought your own role in these and related events through as I suggested. Or, you may disagree with my opinion. In your own interest, now and in the future, I do hope you have or will. The whole matter is much more complex than the understanding or thought required for a news story can suggest. So can be the role, no matter how innocently he visualizes it, of the writer or any one news story. You, personally, are caught up in these events, in the normal desires and responsibilities of a reporter, and were this not potential complication enough, a firm and pretty inflexible position by your paper, one not reached or fixed by news considerations. We are far from the end, even the beginning of the end. I do not believe this recent development was purposeless or that it was a one-shot. I take the liberty of suggesting that your personal interest lies in making a full record now, keeping one in the future, and seeking and taking advice when it is available for the asking. You can always make up your own mind, but not on the basis of no information. Had you in early January you would still have had an exclusive, but it would have been a better and more important story and you might not, in the future, be plagued by it as I now believe, in time if not already, you will be. If you thought you served other interests, you may, in the end, conclude you might have served them better, too.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg